

X237/301

NATIONAL
QUALIFICATIONS
2009

WEDNESDAY, 27 MAY
1.00 PM – 3.40 PM

PHILOSOPHY
HIGHER

You should answer

Section 1 – Question 1

Section 2 – **Either** Question 2
OR Question 3

Section 3 – Question 4 **AND**
Either Question 5
OR Question 6

Section 4 – Question 7 **AND**
Question 8



SECTION 1

Marks Code

Critical Thinking in Philosophy

Question 1

(You should answer all parts, (a–d), of this question).

- (a) A statement and an argument differ in a number of ways. Clearly explain the difference between a statement and an argument. **4 KU**
- (b) Clearly explain the difference between valid and invalid arguments. Support your answer with an example of each type of argument. **3 KU**
- (c) Imagine you read an argument and have no idea whether any of the premises are true or false. To what extent would you be able to come to a decision about the **soundness** of the argument? Explain your answer. **3 KU**
- (d) Read the following extract and answer the questions that follow.

New Zealand is well known for being a safe country to live in. This is seen in the fact that after the attack on the twin towers in New York there was an increase in the number of New Zealanders returning home and in times of trouble people have always looked for a place where they can feel safe.

According to the New Zealand government it is true that between 2001 and 2003 there was an increase in “permanent and long-term arrivals” of New Zealand citizens returning from overseas.

- (i) Analyse and evaluate the extract, using the skills you have learned in your study of critical thinking. In your answer you should give consideration to:
- identifying any premises and conclusion
 - identifying possible hidden premises (if any)
 - whether the argument might be inductive or deductive
 - whether the argument is valid/invalid, sound/unsound.

Where appropriate you should explain your reasoning.

6 AE

- (ii) Some would say that the extract contains one or more fallacies. Do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.

4 AE

(20)

Either

Question 2

(You should only answer this question if you have studied the debate “**Is there a rational basis for belief in God?**” If not, go to Question 3.)

Read the following extract and answer the questions that follow.

“Look at the world—the whole world and every part of the world—you will see that it is just one big machine made up of an infinite number of smaller machines. When we use our human intelligence to build machines we make sure that they are well-designed for the job they are meant to do. It is just like this in nature with every little bit being just right for the role it has to play—although in nature everything works together even more impressively than in human products. Since the end results are similar we can use the rules of analogy to infer that the causes are also similar, and that whatever is responsible for the natural world is somewhat similar to a human mind—albeit with much greater powers for they will be in proportion to the magnificence of the natural world. This a posteriori argument is enough to prove that there is a god and that he resembles human mind and intelligence.

David Hume, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*
Re-written in modern English

- | | | | |
|-----|---|------|----|
| (a) | What is an argument from analogy?
Give your own example to illustrate your answer. | 4 | KU |
| (b) | What is meant by an <i>a posteriori</i> argument? | 2 | KU |
| (c) | Explain in your own words the argument being described by Hume in this passage. | 4 | KU |
| (d) | How successful is this kind of argument in proving the existence of God? | 10 | AE |
| | | (20) | |

Or

Question 3

(You should only answer this question if you have studied the debate “**Do we have free will?**”)

“Some people say we are free when we do what we desire. But surely a cigarette smoker isn’t free when she’s standing out in the rain just to satisfy her desire to smoke.”

- | | | | |
|-----|---|------|----|
| (a) | Discuss how libertarians and hard determinists might respond to this statement. | 6 | KU |
| | | 4 | AE |
| (b) | Does the example of smoking pose a particular difficulty for compatibilists? | 4 | KU |
| | | 6 | AE |
| | | (20) | |

Section 3 – Epistemology

Marks Code

Question 4

(You should answer **all** parts of this question and **either** Question 5 **or** Question 6.)

- (a) In what way does propositional knowledge differ from other kinds of knowledge? 2 KU
- (b) What is the distinction between necessary truth and contingent truth? Give examples to illustrate your answer. 4 KU
- (c) What are the key features of empiricism? 4 KU
- (10)**

Either

Question 5

(You should only answer this question if you have studied **Descartes' Rationalism** in the Epistemology Unit. If not, go to Question 6.)

- (a) Why did Descartes write the Meditations? 4 KU

Read the statement below then answer parts (b) and (c).

“All that remains for me is to ask how I received this idea of God . . . the only option remaining is that this idea is innate in me, just as the idea of myself is innate in me.”

- 6 KU**
- (b) Explain the role God plays in Descartes' argument. **4 AE**
- (c) How far has Descartes achieved his aims by the end of Meditation Three? **16 AE**
- (30)**

Or

Question 6

(You should only answer this question if you have studied **Hume's Empiricism** in the Epistemology Unit.)

Read the statement below then answer **all** parts of this question.

“All of our reasonings concerning matter of fact are found on a species of ANALOGY”.

- (a) What does Hume mean by “reasonings concerning matter of fact”? 4 KU
- (b) Explain Hume's argument that there are close similarities between human reason and the reason of animals. **6 KU**
4 AE
- (c) Does Hume succeed in showing that we do not use reason in gaining knowledge of cause and effect? **16 AE**
- (30)**

Section 4 – Moral Philosophy

Marks Code

You should answer **both** questions – Question 7 **and** Question 8.

Question 7

You find you have the opportunity to cheat in an exam that will win you a place in medical school. Discuss how Kantians and utilitarians would respond to this situation.

15 KU
15 AE
(30)

Question 8

- (a) Explain why emotivists say that moral judgements are not statements of fact.
- (b) What criticisms could be made of the emotivist position?

5 KU
5 AE
(10)

[END OF QUESTION PAPER]

[BLANK PAGE]

[BLANK PAGE]

[BLANK PAGE]