

Section One: Reasoning and Inquiry Skills**(30 Marks)**

Attempt all questions in this section.

Allow approximately 50 minutes for this section.

Part A)**4 marks****Question 1****[1 mark]**

What is the technical name for the following formal fallacy?

If the sun sets then it actually goes to bed, as in, it tucks itself into a warm bed to sleep. But we all know the sun never sets so obviously it doesn't go to bed either.

Denying the Antecedent (1 mark)

Question 2**[1 mark]**

What is the technical name for the following formal fallacy?

If you hear the bongo drums deep in the night then Lil' Pebbles is still out there, partying eternally. It is known that the party never ends for our friend Lil' P and so, without any doubt, you will hear the rhythmic thud of the bongo drum as the night sinks to its darkest hour.

Affirming the Consequent (1 mark)

Question 3**[2 marks]**

What is the technical name for the following formal fallacy? Justify your answer.

Without radical change, the world's environment is doomed. However, the environment is not doomed and so, there was radical change.

Denying the Antecedent (1 mark)

The argument can be understood as follows:

Without p then q. Which means that 'p' is necessary for 'not q' but does not guarantee 'not q'. Therefore, it is of the form:

If a (the world's environment is not doomed) then b (there was radical change)

A

therefore, b (1 mark)

Part B)**8 marks****Question 4****[2 marks]**

What is the inferential strength of the major inferential move in the following argument? Justify your answer.

Black holes are incredibly dense parts of space with intense gravitation fields and donut holes are intensely unsatisfying because they lack ‘donuty goodness.’ Therefore, all holes are intense.

Inductively weak. (1 mark)

Because, while the descriptor “intense” may apply to some very small sub-category of ‘holes’ it is certainly not true for most. Two examples do not moderately or strongly infer the universal claim. (1 mark)

Question 5**[2 marks]**

What is the inferential strength of the following argument? Justify your answer.

If the majority of the Lego bricks in the bag are yellow then there is a chance you will draw out a yellow Lego brick at random. But most of the Lego bricks in the bag are not yellow and so, there is no chance you will draw out a yellow Lego brick at random.

Deductively invalid or inductively nil (1 mark)

It is a formal fallacy (i.e. denying the antecedent and hence, the conclusion is not necessitated (deductively invalid) and the conclusion does not follow. (1 mark)

*Teachers note: all inferential moves (for the sake of simplicity and in relation to the PAE curriculum) fall into two connected categories. Deductive arguments attempt or are intended to make the premise(s) entail (necessitate/guarantee) the conclusion(s). Inductive arguments attempt or are intended to show that the premise(s) likely (i.e. high probability) support the conclusion(s). If an argument uses premise(s) to successfully entail the conclusion(s) then we say this argument is valid. If an argument fails to use the premise(s) to entail the conclusion(s), we say it is invalid. Particularly, if an argument seems to be structured in a deductive form (e.g. denying the antecedent and affirming the consequent) but fails to use the premise(s) to entail the conclusion(s) then we – consistent with the clarification above – call this an invalid argument. All invalid arguments are still probabilistic and hence, inductive. Concisely, if a conclusion is not guaranteed then you are still left with the question of how likely (probability) does the conclusion(s) follow from the premise(s). Keeping this in mind, an argument could be deductively invalid but inductively strong. In the case above (Question 5) the argument is both deductively invalid and there is no probability of the conclusion following from the premises.

Question 6**[2 marks]**

What is the inferential strength of the major inferential move in the following argument? Justify your answer.

I know I will soon, once more, taste the delicious flavour of an iced mocha frappuccino. This is because, once a year, on the winter solstice, I march down to my favourite café to order an iced mocha frappuccino to celebrate the death and rebirth of the Sun. Also, we are entering the depths of winter as the solstice is occurring within the week.

Inductively strong (1 mark)

Because, while the conclusion is not guaranteed the regularity of the event occurring (ordering an iced mocha frappuccino) with the timing (winter solstice) means it is highly probable that the conclusion follows. (1 mark)

Question 7

[2 marks]

What is the inferential strength of the following argument? Justify your answer

Without art we would be mere animals. But we do have art and therefore, we are not animals.

Deductively valid (1 mark)

The argument is Modus Tollens and can be understood as follows:

Without p then q. Which means that 'p' is necessary for 'not q' but does not guarantee 'not q'. Therefore, it is of the form:

If a (we are mere animals) then b (art does not exist)

Not b

therefore, not a (1 mark)

Part C)

8 Marks

Question 8

[2 marks]

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

Most computer games are violent. This is because the computer game series Grand Theft Auto is violent and they are very popular computer games.

Hasty Generalisation (1 mark)

Because, while the Grand Theft Auto series is violent in some ways, one sample (example) of a violent computer game does not support that all games are violent. (1 mark)

Question 9

[2 marks]

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

It is certainly the case that Nietzsche and Marx had fantastic facial hair. In fact, many philosophers over the years have had some sort of facial hair. But Nietzsche only had an amazing moustache not beard like most philosophers and so, we should pay no attention to what he says.

Ad hominem (1 mark)

Deciding to disregard Nietzsche based on a personal characteristic and not the quality of his arguments is fallacious. (1 mark)

Question 10

[2 marks]

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

I spoke to a cognitive scientist about dental health and they advised me that learning a language is great for increasing my cognitive abilities which in turn would aid my dental health.

If someone is going to know stuff about teeth, a cognitive scientist will and so I'm going to learn French.

Irrelevant authority (1 mark)

Because, while a cognitive scientist would know a lot about brains and cognitions, they are not a relevant authority on dental health. (1 mark)

Question 11

[2 marks]

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

Area 51 is the location where supposedly the USA holds and researches aliens and alien technology. We cannot know that there definitely are not any aliens being held in Area 51 and so I propose that we raid Area 51 to find the aliens.

Argument from Ignorance (1 mark)

Because, merely having a lack of evidence of aliens in Area 51 does not support the notion that we should raid Area 51. (1 mark)

Part D)

10 marks

Question 12

[2 mark]

State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

Some politicians value winning an election to maintain power above justice. No politician who values winning an election to maintain power above justice is a truly good leader. Therefore, no politicians are truly good leaders.

Not cogent. (1 mark)

P1 is rationally acceptable.

P2 is rationally acceptable.

The inference is deductively invalid and inductively weak. Some is not synonymous with all. (1 mark)

*See Teachers Note for Question 5.

Question 13

[2 marks]

State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

If all cats are mammals then they must have fur like other mammals. Some cats are furless hence, some cats are not mammals.

Not cogent. (1 mark)

P1 is not rationally acceptable. Some mammals are furless, for example adult dolphins.

P2 is rationally acceptable.

The inference is deductively valid, of the form Modus Tollens. (1 mark)

Question 14**[2 marks]**

State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

Some Australians are revolutionary socialists, since some Australians support revolution and some Australians are socialists.

Not cogent. (1 mark)

P1 and P2 are rationally acceptable and the inference is inductively weak. To make the inference stronger you would have to explicitly state that revolution and socialism often go together. (1 mark)

Question 15**[2 marks]**

State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

Fixing any situation is easily done by adding more animal shaped balloons to the situation. There have been long-standing and significant tensions between Australia and New Zealand. Because of this we should parachute in as many animal shaped balloons into the Australian / New Zealand areas as we can.

Not cogent. (1 mark)

P1 is not rationally acceptable.

P2 is not rationally acceptable.

The inference is inductively strong. (1 mark)

Question 16**[2 marks]**

State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

Terrorism is the violent intervention of state A into state B to achieve A's objectives. The USA has violently intervened into the Middle East to achieve the USA's objectives. Therefore, the USA is engaged in terrorism.

Not cogent. (1 mark)

P1 is contentious. The definition of terrorism is difficult to find agreement on.

P2 is rationally acceptable.

The inference is deductively valid. (1 mark)

End of Section One

Section Two: Philosophical Analysis**(40 Marks)**

This section contains **two** questions. Answer both questions.

Suggested working time for this section is 80 minutes.

Question 17 – Community of Inquiry**20 marks**

In the following dialogue, you are required to:

- summarise (2 marks)
- clarify (6 marks)
- and critically evaluate (12 marks)

the contributions of each participant

Syllabus Dot Points

- Privacy and it's limits
- Government Interference and Surveillance
- Freedom of Expression and it's limits

Julian – Our school has just introduced a new I.T policy. It means that all of our activity 'on-line' is now being monitored by a moderator. If we are seen to be looking at anything that is deemed 'inappropriate' we will face consequences, such as having our access to the internet revoked and letters being sent home to parents! This is spying on us! It's an outrage!

Introduces the discussion and sets the scene. Sets out the position that surveillance is wrong. However, the position outlined is not spying – as students were informed of the action. Spying only takes place when it is done without someone's knowledge. The discussion concerns surveillance.

Chelsea – Quite right too. I think it is very sensible. All of my classmates waste their lesson time playing games, or shopping for dresses for the Ball. It takes away so much of the teacher's attention in policing their behaviour that they can't teach us properly. This new policy will stop people messing around and lead to better performance.

Sets out the opposing position that surveillance is a good thing. Commits the fallacy of Hasty generalisation by stating that all of her classmates are using IT inappropriately. (They could be – but this is unlikely). Makes the point that using surveillance will lead to improved outcomes in the classroom.

Julian – I can't take that argument seriously. I'm not going to listen to any line of reasoning from such a try-hard. Any-one with half a brain can see that this is an assault on our basic human right to privacy. What we do on our computers – and they are *our* computers by the way, not the school's – should be our business. If I want to spend my time looking at shoes and dresses then I should be allowed to do so without any interference from the School.

Rejects the position put forward by Chelsea by using the Genetic Fallacy, which is followed by an Ad hominem. Reinforces the position by stating that surveillance is an assault of basic human rights on the basis that students are free to use their devices and their time as they wish.

Chelsea – I don't know why you are so angry about this. If you have nothing to hide, then you should not be worried. No School I.T. moderator is going to be interested in your use of *Sparknotes* or *Wikipedia*. Anyway, a study I saw on the ABC showed that Schools who monitor their Students' 'on-line' behaviour also show other benefits such as a drop in bullying and other anti-social behaviour as well as improved achievement in the classroom. So that makes it worthwhile.

Continues to hold the position by explaining that there should be no need to worry if someone were doing the right thing, then they should have nothing to hide. Supports the main position with the use of research from a reputable source that shows that surveillance reduces anti-social behaviour and improves attainment – therefore it is worthwhile.

Julian – But that's not the point! It sets a very dangerous precedent – who knows what the school will do with our private information! No benefit in the world is worth sacrificing a person's right to privacy. That is an absolute right that should not be violated under any circumstances. I will be writing to the Principal about this – it all demonstrates that surveillance is damaging to society.

Concludes his position by saying that surveillance sets a dangerous precedent – the data could be used to be sold or retained to be used for inappropriate actions. In addition, surveillance sacrifices a right to privacy, which he believes is an Absolute right that should never be violated – however no justification is given for this claim. This leads to the Main conclusion that surveillance is damaging to society.

The arguments of the two participants could look like this:

Julian's argument:

P1 – Humans are free to do whatever they choose to do and use their possessions however they wish to

P2 – Surveillance sets a dangerous precedent as the data could be used for any purpose.

P3 – Privacy is an absolute right that should never be violated

MC – Surveillance damages society

Chelsea's argument:

P1 – Surveillance reduces distraction and improves performance in the classroom

P2 – Surveillance should not be a concern if you have nothing to hide

P3 – Surveillance reduces anti-social behaviour and improves attainment

MC – Surveillance is a Positive tool to improve society.

Section Two: Philosophical Analysis (continued)

Question 18 – Passage Analysis

20 marks

Passage One:

We understand the world subjectively. That is, everything we experience is within our own mind. Our subjective understanding is a process of meaning making. We see a hat. We don't experience the hat for what it is directly, we can't know the hat objectively, we only experience the hat as what it represents to us. This representation is known as the process of signification. Each sign, like the hat, has two parts; signifier (the hat) and the signified (what the hat means). This making of meaning, the decoding, is informed by the symbolic code. In order to communicate meaning with others we must share a symbolic code. The symbolic code informs us about what things mean. Our understanding of the world is informed by the symbolic codes we share. Therefore, the further apart different shared symbolic codes are, the more our understanding of the world differ.

Syllabus Dot Point:

- the use of symbols, signs and signification (semiosis) to understand the world
 1. We experience and understand the world subjectively.
 2. The content of understanding is meaning making.
 3. The world represents itself to us through signs which contain a signifier and signified.
 4. Our interpretation of a sign's meaning is informed by the symbolic code which is shared.

Therefore,

5. As symbolic codes differ between people so does their understanding of the world differ.

1 + 2 + 3 + 4



5

Passage Two:

People who brag about the number of friends or followers they have on social media have made a fundamental error when it comes to friendship. Friends on social media should not be considered real friends. One of the main reasons you have friends online is so they can like your posts and comment on how great you look. This sort of 'friendship' is based on pleasure. You're essentially using them as a means to an end. This is not friendship at all, it's just selfishness. Some people might say friendship is based on the 'you scratch my back, then I'll scratch yours' principle. This is how the social media world operates, commenting and liking your 'friends' post in the desperate hope they'll return the like. If they don't return the 'like', they're no longer useful as a friend. Once again, this is just self-interest. Friendship is based on caring for one another, sharing with one another and 'doing life together,' not on self-interest which is why friendship can only exist in real life.

1. Friendship based on pleasure is selfish.
2. Friendship based on utility is selfish.
3. Friendship is based on caring and sharing life together.
4. Caring is not based on self-interest.

Therefore

5. Friendship can only exist in real life.

1+2+3+4



5

Passage Three:

When doing philosophy, it has been argued that culture should be set aside. However, it is the case that the concept of culture can never be removed from the philosophical approach. In Nigeria, for instance, the cultures of the various ethnic groups, including their proverbs, wise-sayings, traditional stories or folklores and language; contain the philosophies of these ethnic groups. This shows that there are elements of culture in every philosophy. When studying specific phenomena, one's beliefs around shared values and social roles can never be entirely removed from one's predispositions in relation to the concept being studied. No form of philosophy is immune to this cultural influence. This is because culture forms the background for every philosophy and, as such, gives meaning to philosophy.

1. There are elements of culture in every philosophy
2. Culture can never be entirely removed from one's predispositions in relation to the concept being studied
3. No form of philosophy is immune from this cultural influence
4. Culture forms the background for every philosophy and gives meaning to philosophy.
5. The concept of culture cannot be removed from the philosophical approach

4

1+2+3

5

The concept of culture, including shared values and social roles.

Section Three: Extended Argument**(30 Marks)**

This section contains **five (5)** questions. Answer **one (1)** question only. Write your answer in the spaces provided.

Suggested working time for this section is 50 minutes.

Choose **one (1)** of the following five questions. Argue for or against the statement in the question, giving clear definitions, examples and reasons.

Question 19

Humans can never be given completely equal rights.

Question 20

More than one interpretation of the same thing can be reasonable.

Question 21

Art must be beautiful.

Question 22

The incidence of war would be greatly reduced if the principle of the I-thou was universally embraced.

Question 23

Robots are capable of emotions.

