



ATAR course examination, 2020

Question/Answer booklet

PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS

Please place your student identification label in this box

WA student number: In figures

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

In words

Time allowed for this paper

Reading time before commencing work: ten minutes

Working time: three hours

Materials required/recommended for this paper

To be provided by the supervisor

This Question/Answer booklet

Number of additional
answer booklets used
(if applicable):

To be provided by the candidate

Standard items: pens (blue/black preferred), pencils (including coloured), sharpener,
correction fluid/tape, eraser, ruler, highlighters

Special items: nil

Important note to candidates

No other items may be taken into the examination room. It is **your** responsibility to ensure that you do not have any unauthorised material. If you have any unauthorised material with you, hand it to the supervisor **before** reading any further.

Structure of this paper

Section	Number of questions available	Number of questions to be answered	Suggested working time (minutes)	Marks available	Percentage of examination
Section One Critical reasoning	8	8	50	30	30
Section Two Philosophical analysis and evaluation					
Part A	1	1	40	20	20
Part B	1	1	40	20	20
Section Three Construction of argument	5	1	50	30	30
Total					100

Instructions to candidates

1. The rules for the conduct of the Western Australian external examinations are detailed in the *Year 12 Information Handbook 2020: Part II Examinations*. Sitting this examination implies that you agree to abide by these rules.
2. Write your answers in this Question/Answer booklet.
3. You must be careful to confine your answers to the specific questions asked and to follow any instructions that are specific to a particular question.
4. Supplementary pages for planning/continuing your answers to questions are provided at the end of this Question/Answer booklet. If you use these pages to continue an answer, indicate at the original answer where the answer is continued, i.e. give the page number.

Section One: Critical reasoning**30% (30 Marks)**

This section contains **eight** questions. Answer **all** questions in the spaces provided.

Suggested working time: 50 minutes.

Question 1**(3 marks)**

- (a) Express the following sentence as a disjunctive (either X or Y) statement. (1 mark)

If Kyra is playing poker, then she is gambling.

- (b) If Jon is able to attend an Australian university, then Jon has English competency. (1 mark)

Underline the sentence that means the same as the above sentence.

- (i) Jon is able to attend an Australian university if he has English competency.
- (ii) Either Jon is able to attend an Australian university or he has English competency.
- (iii) Jon is able to attend an Australian university only if he has English competency.
- (c) Unless surgery is performed, the patient will not survive. (1 mark)

Underline the sentence that means the same as the above sentence.

- (i) Surgery is a necessary condition for the patient's survival.
- (ii) Surgery is a sufficient condition for the patient's survival.
- (iii) Surgery is necessary and sufficient for the patient's survival.

Question 2

(3 marks)

- (a) Name the fallacy committed in the following argument. (1 mark)

Regardless of how minor their offenses against the law, climate-change protesters participating in civil disobedience cannot go unchallenged. If we allow these protesters to disrupt the flow of traffic, then anyone and everyone can block the streets for any reason.

- (b) Name the fallacy committed in the following argument. (1 mark)

Since taxation is theft, there can be no moral justification for the imposition of taxes on citizens by their governments.

- (c) Name the fallacy committed in the following argument. (1 mark)

Barry is accused of murdering Paula, and there is significant evidence in favour of his guilt. But Barry is Paula’s neighbour, so it is definitely not true that he murdered her.

Question 3

(3 marks)

We should be cautious about permitting human enhancement through the use of genetic engineering. Given the cost of such technologies, it seems very unlikely that governments would be willing to provide access to genetic engineering for all citizens. Inequality is already at an unacceptable level in our society, and genetic engineering will only further increase the divide between the rich and the poor.

For the above argument:

- (a) underline the conclusion (1 mark)

- (b) evaluate the cogency of the argument. Circle the correct answer (1 mark)

Cogent

Not cogent

- (c) give **one** reason for your answer to part (b). (1 mark)

Question 4**(5 marks)**

If my beliefs are formed by reliable processes, then I have justification for my beliefs. If my beliefs are the product of an elaborate deception, then they have not been formed by reliable processes. But, since I cannot rule out the possibility that my beliefs are the product of an elaborate deception, I cannot rule out the possibility that my beliefs have been formed by unreliable processes. It follows that I cannot have justification for my beliefs.

For the above argument:

- (a) circle any inference indicators (2 marks)
- (b) underline the conclusion (1 mark)
- (c) circle the word that **best** describes the strength of the inference to the conclusion (1 mark)

Weak

Moderate

Strong

- (d) give **one** reason for your answer to part (c). (1 mark)

Question 5**(3 marks)**

Are the following statements analytic or synthetic?

- (a) Whenever Lucy does physical exercise, she lifts weights. (1 mark)

- (b) Whenever Lucy is lifting weights, she is doing physical exercise. (1 mark)

- (c) Either Lucy is not lifting weights or she is doing physical exercise. (1 mark)

See next page

Question 6

(2 marks)

Construct a deductively-valid argument that uses **all** the following statements only **once**. Use a diagram to represent the argument you construct.

- (1) The right to liberty entails a right to democratic participation.
- (2) Every individual has a right to liberty.
- (3) The right to self-government entails a right to democratic participation.
- (4) Every individual has a right to democratic participation.
- (5) The right to liberty entails a right to self-government.



Question 7**(5 marks)**

Since God is all powerful, there is evil in the world only if God is allowing it. But God wouldn't allow evil in the world unless He had a good reason to. There is evil in the world. So, God must be allowing evil, and we can conclude that He has a good reason for allowing it.

For the above argument:

- (a) underline the conclusion (1 mark)
- (b) bracket and number the separable statements (1 mark)
- (c) using the numbers from part (b), draw a diagram of the argument. (3 marks)



- (c) evaluate the cogency of the argument. Circle the correct answer (1 mark)

Cogent

Not cogent

- (d) give **two** reasons for your answer to part (c). (2 marks)

One: _____

Two: _____

End of Section One

See next page

Section Two: Philosophical analysis and evaluation**40% (40 Marks)**

This section has **two** parts: Part A and Part B. Each part contains **one** question. Answer **both** questions.

Write your answers on the lined pages following Question 9 and Question 10.

Supplementary pages for planning/continuing your answers to questions are provided at the end of this Question/Answer booklet. If you use these pages to continue an answer, indicate at the original answer where the answer is continued, i.e. give the page number.

Suggested working time: 80 minutes.

Part A**20% (20 Marks)****Question 9****(20 marks)**

The following dialogue is an excerpt from a community of inquiry.

You are required to:

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

Mitchell: According to social contract theory, citizens are obliged to obey their governments and abide by the laws that have been established because of a contract that has been made among the citizens. But this doesn't apply to me. I've never signed the contract! And since I've never seen anyone else sign it either, the theory is obviously false.

Ariane: Think of it this way. Suppose you go to a restaurant and order a nice meal. Suppose you finish the meal and then the waitress brings you the bill. Having eaten the meal, it would be absurd for you to then try to avoid paying the bill by insisting that you had never explicitly stated that you would pay for it. You gave your consent to pay when you ordered and ate the meal. In a similar way, there are many benefits to living in a society that has the rule of law and a functioning government. By voluntarily accepting these benefits you can be said to have implicitly given your consent to the government, and in giving your consent, you are obliged to obey the law. This is what the social contract is all about.

Mitchell: The first problem with your argument is that I have never been the recipient of any welfare payments from the government. So I can't be said to have accepted any benefits of government. It follows from this that I haven't implicitly consented to government any more than I have explicitly consented. Secondly, the very idea of implicit consent is suspect. There can be no binding implicit agreement if I say explicitly that I don't agree. I don't agree with the laws of this government. And I don't agree to be bound by such laws.

Ariane: Have you ever called the police for assistance? Did you or do your children go to a public school? Have you ever driven on the freeway? If the answer to any of these questions is yes, then there are some benefits of government that you have accepted. In that case, you'll need to make sure you obey the law. Just like the rest of us.

See next page

Lined writing area with 28 horizontal lines.

See next page

Part B**20% (20 Marks)****Question 10****(20 marks)**

Choose **one** of the following passages and:

- summarise the passage (2 marks)
- clarify its meaning (8 marks)
- evaluate it critically. (10 marks)

Passage One

Those who are trying to ensure that animals are not mistreated are not doing their cause any favours when they insist that animals have rights. This is because animals do not have rights. Only beings who can make moral claims against one another and respond to such claims can have rights, and animals are not the kinds of beings that are capable of exercising and responding to moral claims. This is not to say that we have no duties toward animals. We should not be cruel to animals, and we ought to treat them humanely. But again, this is not because animals have rights. Rather, it is because of the fact that cruelty toward human beings is immoral, and that those who are cruel in their treatment of animals are cruel in their treatment of human beings as well. Hence, all our obligations to animals derive from the obligations we have toward other human beings. The goal of improving the treatment of animals may be better served by pointing out the real source of our obligations to animals.

Passage Two

Imagine that you were going on a week-long road trip with your friends in a car but you had doubts about whether your car was in good enough condition to last the journey. Let's say you had taken the car to get serviced a few months ago and there were some serious issues with the car which you couldn't afford to get fixed at the time. The road trip with your friends would likely be a lot of fun but it would be very irresponsible of you to believe, despite your doubts, that it was safe to take your car on the road trip. You would be putting your friends in danger if you acted on this belief. Clearly it is dangerous to form a belief about anything for which we do not have sufficient evidence. Believing that God exists is just like this. Since there are serious doubts about each of the major arguments in favour of God's existence it is irresponsible to ignore these doubts and to believe in God anyway. But the same is true of atheism. Doubts about the adequacy of arguments which claim to prove that God does not exist are just as serious. There is simply not enough evidence in either direction. The only responsible position to take on the matter is agnosticism.

Passage Three

There is no moral obligation to do anything about our changing climate. I have two reasons for saying this. Firstly, those who are alive today won't be around to see the negative effects of our inaction, so they won't be harmed by it. Secondly, we cannot make sense of the idea that future generations will be harmed by a changing climate. Imagine some future person living on Earth in the year 2150. Suppose that the climate has changed drastically by that time and that life is not as easy for this person as it has been for us. Even so, we cannot meaningfully say that this person has been harmed by our inaction. This is because that person would not exist if we were to act now to prevent changes in the climate. Even small changes to our lives today will have some impact on which potential persons are brought into existence in future generations. If someone wouldn't exist if not for our inaction, they cannot be said to have been harmed by our inaction.

End of Section Two
Section Three begins on page 22
See next page

Section Three: Construction of argument**30% (30 Marks)**

This section contains **five** questions. Answer **one** question. Write your answer on the lined pages provided following Question 15. Argue for or against the statement with clear definitions, examples and reasons.

Marks will be awarded for demonstration of:

- philosophical understandings (10 marks)
- philosophical argument (15 marks)
- clarity and structure. (5 marks)

Supplementary pages for planning/continuing your answers to questions are provided at the end of this Question/Answer booklet. If you use these pages to continue an answer, indicate at the original answer where the answer is continued, i.e. give the page number.

Suggested working time: 50 minutes.

Question 11**(30 marks)**

Our obligations to those outside of our own society are no different from the obligations we have to those within our society.

Question 12**(30 marks)**

The use of drone strikes is morally preferable to other methods of killing in war.

Question 13**(30 marks)**

Authenticity is only possible in societies that value individualism over social conformity.

Question 14**(30 marks)**

By focusing on the appearance of things in conscious experience, we can come to understand our own nature and the nature of the world around us.

Question 15**(30 marks)**

The scientific method generates a world view that is incompatible with religion.

End of questions

This document – apart from any third party copyright material contained in it – may be freely copied, or communicated on an intranet, for non-commercial purposes in educational institutions, provided that it is not changed and that the School Curriculum and Standards Authority is acknowledged as the copyright owner, and that the Authority's moral rights are not infringed.

Copying or communication for any other purpose can be done only within the terms of the *Copyright Act 1968* or with prior written permission of the School Curriculum and Standards Authority. Copying or communication of any third party copyright material can be done only within the terms of the *Copyright Act 1968* or with permission of the copyright owners.

Any content in this document that has been derived from the Australian Curriculum may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons [Attribution 4.0 International \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) licence.

An *Acknowledgements variation* document is available on the Authority website.

*Published by the School Curriculum and Standards Authority of Western Australia
303 Sevenoaks Street
CANNINGTON WA 6107*